

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in the application.

Claims 1-10, 13-15, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,177,202, to Takehara et al. (Takehara). Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Takehara in view of UK Patent Application 2154499 (GB '499). Claims 16-20 and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Takehara in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,395,298, to Wetzel et al. (Wetzel). Claims 21 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Takehara in view of Wetzel, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0058767, to Hara et al. (Hara). Claims 24, 25, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over Takehara in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0220919, to Fischer et al. (Fischer).

Clarification with respect to the claim 28 is requested since claim 28 does not stand formally rejected over any prior art.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-39 is requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the first and second rubber compositions are simultaneously extrusion formed in a mold from which they exit in a combined state at a discharge port on the mold. More particularly, claim 1 recites the step of providing a mold having a flow passage with a discharge port. The step of extrusion molding the first and second compositions is characterized as causing: a) the first rubber composition to flow downstream through the flow passage and to and from the discharge port; and b) the second rubber composition to be directed against the first rubber composition and to flow with the first rubber composition through the flow passage to and through the discharge port. The step of extrusion molding has been further characterized as causing the first

rubber composition to flow through a portion of the flow passage without the second rubber composition directed against the first rubber composition.

Takehara teaches formation of the layer of a power transmission belt by extrusion, which applicant acknowledges to be old. Takehara does not teach or suggest simultaneous extrusion of two different compositions as recited in claim 1.

It is not understood exactly how the Examiner is interpreting Takehara. For example, the Examiner references column 6, lines 26-34 of Takehara, as allegedly disclosing details of a mold (see page 3 of Action). Takehara does not disclose any specifics of the mold but merely references extrusion, which is admitted to be old.

In any event, Takehara does not meet the limitations of claim 1. While Takehara refers to conventional extrusion forming processes, Takehara's disclosure would not motivate one skilled in the art to simultaneously mold two different components through extrusion as set forth in claim 1.

Claims 2-26 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant limitations to further distinguish over the art cited by the Examiner.

For example, claim 3 recites details of the mold that are not taught in, or suggested by, Takehara. Claim 3 has been further amended to maintain a distinction between the first and second rubber compositions as they are extruded to more fully clearly distinguish over Takehara.

Claim 15 likewise relates to the configuration of the mold in which the rubber composition is introduced, which is not taught or suggested in Takehara.

In rejecting claims 11 and 12, the Examiner relies on GB '499. GB '499 teaches grinding to form ribs, which applicant acknowledges to be old. In any event, while grinding of ribs is not new, the steps recited in claim 1, on which these claims are based, are not

taught or suggested by GB '499, taken alone or in combination with Takehara or any other known grinding art.

In rejecting claims 16-20, the Examiner relies upon Wetzel in combination with Takehara. Wetzel teaches only extrusion of two separate layers in two separate extrusion molding apparatus. This is not what is recited in applicant's claim 1, on which claims 16-20 are based. The Examiner again alludes to the disclosure in Takehara in column 6, lines 26-34 for the specifics of extrusion. Takehara does not support the disclosure attributed to it by the Examiner in the first and second paragraphs on page 8 of the Action.

In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner relies on Hara. The Examiner references the structure in Fig. 8, which is not related to extrusion, but rather a pressurized molding process with preformed components. It is not certain what relevance Hara has as applied by the Examiner.

In rejecting claims 24 and 25, the Examiner relies on Fischer for the disclosure of a particular pump assembly. Applicant does not take the position that a gear pump is novel. Fischer, while disclosing a pump, does not teach or suggest the limitations in claim 1, on which claims 24 and 25 are based.

Claims 27 has been amended to clarify the presence of distinct first and second compositions that are simultaneously extruded, to more clearly distinguish over the prior art cited by the Examiner. More particularly, claim 27 has been amended to characterize the first and second rubber compositions as flowing through the flow passage and combined in such a manner that the first rubber composition is primarily against the second rubber composition and at the inside peripheral surface and not against the outside peripheral surface, with the second rubber composition primarily against the first rubber

composition and the outside peripheral surface and not against the inside peripheral surface.

The prior art cited by the Examiner, taken in any combination, does not teach or suggest this method.

Claims 28-39 depend cognately from claim 27 and recite further significant limitations to further distinguish over the cited art. The arguments advanced relative to the allowability of claims 1-26, to the extent that they identify deficiencies in the applied prior art, apply likewise to claims 27-39. That is, the prior art does not teach or suggest two different rubber compositions that are simultaneously extruded, but are not initially combined to a state where they would flow through the full extent of the mold.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-39 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: June 19, 2006